

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-11 and rejected same.
Applicant requests reconsideration for the reasons given below.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

At page 3 of the Office action, claims 1-11 are rejected as in the previous Office action, i.e. under 35 USC §103, as being unpatentable over 3GPP TS 33.203 in view of 3GPP TS22.228.

Claim 1 recites a step in which in response to an AV request message sent to an HSS by a S-CSCF of an IMS, the HSS provides, in a AV request response message, a field indicating a list of services to which the UE is subscribed along with either information that allows establishing SAs for each such service or information that could be used as keying material or other input for other security mechanisms specific to each service.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office notes that 3GPP TS 33.203 does not disclose such a step, but cites 3GPP TS 22.228, at §7.3, as disclosing such a step.

In countering the rejection of claim 1, applicant has argued that §7.3 describes only how to display information provided by a service or otherwise respond to a service, not about the service itself. §7.3 is merely a requirement that e.g. a user, at invocation of a session or even in the middle of a session, ought to be able to negotiate or renegotiate capabilities/ attributes associated with the session, such as quality of service (QoS). The "capabilities" being "negotiated" are the capabilities the user equipment has and the capabilities the IMS has (for use in providing IM services). Besides a user asking for a QoS from the IMS in providing a service subscribed-to by the user, the IMS and the user equipment must agree on a modulation and coding scheme, as well as other aspects of the communication. The

"capabilities" being negotiated are not the IM services referred to in the rejected claims, i.e. IM services to which a UE is subscribed. Services, as opposed to capabilities, are referred to in section 7.1, not section 7.3. And section 7.1 notes only that: "There is no requirement to support standardized subscription mechanisms for IP multimedia applications."

In response, the Examiner explains in the final Office action, that:

The Examiner interprets the negotiation of capabilities "to identify and select the available media components" [stated in §7.3] as indicating the transfer of information regarding media services available to the user, because the list of available services would be directly related to the available components. Furthermore, in order to "take into account the information in the user profile" [as also stated in §7.3], the IMS would have to access the HSS to read the user profile (where information about subscribed services would be stored). According to 3GPP TS 33.203 §6.1.1, the AV-Req-Resp CM2 is the only way for this data to be transferred, as it is the only connection outbound from the HSS. Therefore, if information about available media components (and as a result, the available media services) is to be made available to the UE during capabilities negotiation, information from the user profile are inherently transmitted in messages CM2, SM4, SM5, and SM6.

Applicant respectfully submits that a list of available services is not what is recited, and whether the list of available services would or would not be directly related to the available components (the capabilities the user equipment has and/or the capabilities the IMS has) is thus not relevant. What is relevant is a list of services to which the UE is subscribed. In addition though, there can be many available services, and the UE may wish to use the same capabilities negotiation for many or even all of these, or instead use some other capabilities negotiation for the same services. Thus, it cannot reasonably be asserted that there is any one-to-one mapping between the capabilities being negotiated and either services to which the UE

is subscribed or simply available services, as there must be in order for the capabilities to imply the services.

Thus, it cannot fairly be said that TS 22.228 teaches or suggests a step of communicating a list (or a field indicating such a list) of services to which a UE is subscribed, let alone communicating such a list along with either information that allows establishing SAs for each such service or information that could be used as keying material or other input for other security mechanisms specific to each service, let alone providing such a list and related information in an AV request response message.

The same argumentation applies to the rejections of all the other independent claims.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

23 Jan. 2006

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Retter
Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955